

# Integrable discretizations of the spin Ruijsenaars–Schneider models

Orlando RAGNISCO

Dipartimento di Fisica, Terza Università di Roma,  
Via Vasca Navale 84, Roma, Italy  
e-mail: ragnisco @ roma1.infn.it

and

Yuri B. SURIS

Centre for Complex Systems and Visualization, University of Bremen,  
Kitzbuehler Str. 2, 28359 Bremen, Germany  
e-mail: suris @ cevis.uni-bremen.de

**Abstract.** Integrable discretizations are introduced for the rational and hyperbolic spin Ruijsenaars–Schneider models. These discrete dynamical systems are demonstrated to belong to the same integrable hierarchies as their continuous–time counterparts. Explicit solutions are obtained for arbitrary flows of the hierarchies, including the discrete time ones.

# 1 Introduction

The famous Calogero–Moser many-particle model possesses the most ramified tree of all possible kinds of generalizations. Even at the classical (non-quantum) level, one has three types of the usual Calogero–Moser (CM) systems: rational, hyperbolic/trigonometric, and elliptic [1], [2]. They may be viewed as being related to the  $A_{N-1}$  root system, and there exist immediate generalizations to other root systems [1]. A relativistic generalization of the CM systems constitute the Ruijsenaars–Schneider (RS) models [3], [4], appearing also in three variants (rational, hyperbolic/trigonometric, and elliptic). Some time ago spin generalizations of the CM models were introduced [5], [6], recently they attracted more attention [7], [8], [9]. Finally, a spin generalization of the RS model was introduced and studied very recently [10]; it found its application also to the solitons of affine Toda theories [11]. (We have not mentioned some other directions of generalizing the CM model, such as imposing external potentials etc.)

Still another direction of the development of CM type of models is their *time-discretization*, which was started by finding the discrete time CM system in [12] and followed by the discretization of the RS system in [13]. (Actually, the discretizations of the CM model and some its generalizations appeared a decade earlier in the image of Bäcklund transformations [14]). The integrable discretizations found in these papers turned out to have a remarkable property: they belong to the same integrable hierarchies as their continuous time counterparts, i.e. they share with continuous time systems such attributes as Hamiltonian structure, Lax matrices,  $r$ -matrices, action–angle variables and so on. This property was clearly identified and put in a basis of a general procedure of discretization of integrable systems in [15], [16], for the further development see [17], [18], [19].

In the present paper we continue this line of research by applying this general procedure to the spin RS model. Despite the fact that a Hamiltonian structure for this recently introduced system is still unknown, it is possible to attach a hierarchy of flows to this model and to solve explicitly an initial value problem for a general flow of the hierarchy. This is done (for the rational and hyperbolic systems) in Sect.3. The discrete time systems are introduced and studied in Sect.4. In Sect.5 we show what do our results give for the usual RS model (without spins): even in this case we obtain new results, or better, give new insights. Several open problems are outlined in Sect.6.

## 2 Spin RS model

We prefer to give here the results for the hyperbolic and rational spin RS models in a form suitable for our present purposes, since it is difficult to extract the corresponding results from the general setting of [10].

The model is described in terms of  $N$  scalar variables  $x_k$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq N$ ,  $N$  vectors  $|a_k\rangle \in \mathbf{R}^d$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq N$ , and  $N$  covectors  $\langle b_k| \in \mathbf{R}^d$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq N$ . We shall represent vectors  $|a_k\rangle$  as columns of the  $d \times N$  matrix  $A$ , and covectors  $\langle b_k|$  as rows of the  $N \times d$  matrix  $B$ .

The spin RS model proper as given in [10] is described by the equations of motion:

$$\dot{x}_k = \langle b_k | a_k \rangle, \quad (2.1)$$

$$|\dot{a}_k\rangle = -\lambda_k |a_k\rangle - \sum_{j \neq k} |a_j\rangle \langle b_j | a_k \rangle V(x_j - x_k); \quad (2.2)$$

$$\langle \dot{b}_k | = \lambda_k \langle b_k | + \sum_{j \neq k} \langle b_k | a_j \rangle \langle b_j | V(x_k - x_j). \quad (2.3)$$

Here for the rational model

$$V(x) = \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{x + \gamma} = \frac{\gamma}{x(x + \gamma)}, \quad (2.4)$$

and for the hyperbolic one

$$V(x) = \coth(x) - \coth(x + \gamma) = \frac{\sinh(\gamma)}{\sinh(x)\sinh(x + \gamma)}, \quad (2.5)$$

$\gamma$  being parameter of the model. Further,  $\lambda_k = \lambda_k(x, a, b)$  in (2.2), (2.3) are arbitrary functions of the dynamical variables. The simplest possible choice is, of course,  $\lambda_k = 0$ . Solutions of the system with arbitrary  $\lambda_k$ 's may be obtained from the solutions of the system with  $\lambda_k = 0$  upon change of variables  $|a_k\rangle \mapsto \Lambda_k |a_k\rangle$ ,  $\langle b_k| \mapsto \Lambda_k^{-1} \langle b_k|$  with  $\Lambda_k = \exp\left(\int^t \lambda_k(t') dt'\right)$ .

These models admit Lax representations

$$\dot{L} = [M, L] \quad (2.6)$$

with the Lax matrix, which we prefer to choose in the form

$$L = L(x, a, b) = \sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{\gamma}{x_j - x_k + \gamma} \langle b_j | a_k \rangle E_{jk}, \quad (2.7)$$

or

$$L = L(x, a, b) = \sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{\sinh(\gamma)e^{x_k-x_j}}{\sinh(x_j-x_k+\gamma)} \langle b_j | a_k \rangle E_{jk}, \quad (2.8)$$

in the rational and hyperbolic cases, respectively. The matrix  $M = M(x, a, b)$  has the entries

$$M_{jk} = V(x_j - x_k) \langle b_j | a_k \rangle, \quad j \neq k, \quad (2.9)$$

$$M_{kk} = \lambda_k. \quad (2.10)$$

In fact, provided the ansatz (2.7) or (2.8) is given, the Lax equation (3.6) may be derived as a consequence of the following two equations, which are in a sense more fundamental:

$$\dot{A} = -AM, \quad \dot{B} = MB. \quad (2.11)$$

So far, to our knowledge, the Hamiltonian formulation of this model has not been derived. This makes it impossible to give a rigorous statement about complete integrability of the spin RS model. However, an explicit theta-function solution for this model was given in the [10], and we shall now demonstrate that in the rational and hyperbolic cases a simpler solution can be given, in terms of eigenvalues of certain matrices constructed explicitly from the initial conditions, just as for usual CM and RS models [1], [3], and for the spin CM model [5].

### 3 Spin RS hierarchy

We want to show now that the rational and the hyperbolic spin RS models described above are in fact only the simplest representatives of the two corresponding hierarchies, and to derive Lax representations for each flow of these hierarchies. The members of the hierarchies are encoded by an arbitrary conjugation-*covariant* function  $f(L)$  on  $gl(N)$ , the spin RS models proper corresponding to the case  $f(L) = L$ . (Note that in the hypothetical Hamiltonian formulation the members of the hierarchies would be encoded by conjugation-*invariant* Hamiltonian functions  $\varphi(L)$ , such that  $f(L) = L\nabla\varphi(L) = \nabla\varphi(L)L$ , cf. [22] in the non-spin case.)

For a conjugation-covariant function  $f(L)$  we introduce the system of differential equations:

$$\dot{x}_k = f(L)_{kk}, \quad (3.1)$$

$$|\dot{a}_k\rangle = -\lambda_k |a_k\rangle - \sum_{j \neq k} |a_j\rangle M_{jk}, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\langle \dot{b}_k| = \lambda_k \langle b_k| + \sum_{j \neq k} M_{kj} \langle b_j|; \quad (3.3)$$

here in the rational case  $L$  is defined by (2.7), and

$$M_{jk} = \frac{f(L)_{jk}}{x_j - x_k}, \quad j \neq k; \quad (3.4)$$

in the hyperbolic case  $L$  is defined by (2.8), and

$$M_{jk} = \frac{e^{x_j - x_k}}{\sinh(x_j - x_k)} f(L)_{jk}, \quad j \neq k; \quad (3.5)$$

the scalars  $\lambda_k$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq N$  are, as before, arbitrary functions on  $x, a, b$ . (It is easy to see that we recover the system (2.1)–(2.3) for  $f(L) = L$ ).

As the spin RS model proper, this general system also admits Lax representation

$$\dot{L} = [M, L], \quad (3.6)$$

which, given the ansatz (2.7) or (2.8) for the Lax matrix, is a consequence of

$$\dot{A} = -AM, \quad \dot{B} = MB. \quad (3.7)$$

Here the off-diagonal entries of the matrix  $M$  are given by (3.4) or (3.5), respectively, while the diagonal ones – by

$$M_{kk} = \lambda_k. \quad (3.8)$$

To solve the system explicitly for an arbitrary  $f(L)$ , we need to introduce an auxiliary diagonal matrix  $X$  by the following formulas: in the rational case

$$X = \text{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_N), \quad (3.9)$$

and in the hyperbolic case

$$X = \text{diag}(e^{2x_1}, \dots, e^{2x_N}). \quad (3.10)$$

It is important to note that the ansatz (2.7) for the rational Lax matrix is equivalent to

$$XL - LX + \gamma L = \gamma BA, \quad (3.11)$$

while the ansatz (2.8) for the hyperbolic Lax matrix is equivalent to

$$e^\gamma XLX^{-1} - e^{-\gamma} L = 2\sinh(\gamma)BA. \quad (3.12)$$

A key observation necessary for an explicit integration of equations of motion, is the following: the evolution equation for  $x_k$  (3.1) together with the expressions (3.4), (3.5) may be cast in a single matrix differential equation for  $X$ , whose form depends on the case under scrutiny. Namely, for the rational one:

$$\dot{X} = [M, X] + f(L), \quad (3.13)$$

and for the hyperbolic one:

$$\dot{X} = [M, X] + 2Xf(L). \quad (3.14)$$

Now we proceed as in [1], [3], [5]: define the matrix  $V = V(t)$  as the solution of the matrix differential equation

$$\dot{V}V^{-1} = M \quad (3.15)$$

with the initial condition  $V(0) = I$ . Then in the rational case

$$X = X(t) = V(X_0 + tf(L_0))V^{-1}, \quad (3.16)$$

in the hyperbolic case

$$X = X(t) = VX_0e^{2tf(L_0)}V^{-1}, \quad (3.17)$$

and in the both cases

$$L = L(t) = VL_0V^{-1}. \quad (3.18)$$

$$A = A(t) = A_0V^{-1}, \quad B = B(t) = VB_0. \quad (3.19)$$

So, just as in the case of the usual CM and RS models and the spin CM model, in the rational case the positions  $x_k$  are the eigenvalues of the matrix  $X_0 + tf(L_0)$ , and in the hyperbolic case  $\exp(2x_k)$  are the eigenvalues of the matrix  $X_0 \exp(2tf(L_0))$ . As in the spin CM model, the corresponding eigenvectors (i.e. the diagonalizing matrix  $V$ ) define the evolution of spin degrees of freedom. The non-uniqueness of the diagonalizing matrix (which is in principle defined up to a left multiplication by a diagonal matrix) is reflected in the arbitrariness of the diagonal part of the matrix  $M = \dot{V}V^{-1}$ , i.e. of the scalars  $\lambda_k$  (cf. (3.8)).

## 4 Integrable discretizations of the spin RS models

We introduce now two families of maps

$$(x_k, |a_k\rangle, \langle b_k|) \mapsto (\tilde{x}_k, |\tilde{a}_k\rangle, \langle \tilde{b}_k|),$$

depending on the small parameter  $h > 0$  and approximating, as  $h \rightarrow 0$ , the rational and hyperbolic spin RS models, respectively. Just as the spin RS models have  $N$  free parameters  $\lambda_k = \lambda_k(x, a, b)$ , will our maps have  $N$  free parameters  $\mu_k$ .

The rational spin RS map is defined by:

$$\tilde{x}_k - x_k = h\mu_k^{-1} \langle \tilde{b}_k | a_k \rangle, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\mu_k |\tilde{a}_k\rangle - |a_k\rangle = -h \left( \sum_{j \neq k} \frac{|\tilde{a}_j\rangle \langle \tilde{b}_j | a_k \rangle}{\tilde{x}_j - x_k} - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{|a_j\rangle \langle b_j | a_k \rangle}{x_j - x_k + \gamma} \right), \quad (4.2)$$

$$\langle \tilde{b}_k | - \mu_k \langle b_k | = h \left( \sum_{j \neq k} \frac{\langle \tilde{b}_k | a_j \rangle \langle b_j |}{\tilde{x}_k - x_j} - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\langle \tilde{b}_k | \tilde{a}_j \rangle \langle \tilde{b}_j |}{\tilde{x}_k - \tilde{x}_j + \gamma} \right), \quad (4.3)$$

where the parameters  $\mu_k$  are supposed to satisfy the following asymptotic relations:

$$\mu_k(x, \tilde{x}, a, \tilde{a}, b, \tilde{b}; h) = 1 + h\mu_k^{(0)}(x, \tilde{x}, a, \tilde{a}, b, \tilde{b}) + O(h^2). \quad (4.4)$$

The simplest possible choice is, of course,  $\mu_k = 1$ .

The standard implicit functions theorem implies that the equations (4.1)–(4.3) for  $h$  small enough have a unique solution  $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{a}, \tilde{b})$  which is  $O(h)$ -close to  $(x, a, b)$ . Hence a map  $(x, a, b) \mapsto (\tilde{x}, \tilde{a}, \tilde{b})$  is defined, being an approximation of the time  $h$  shift along the trajectories of the rational version of the system (2.1)–(2.3) with

$$\lambda_k(x, a, b) = \mu_k^{(0)}(x, x, a, a, b, b) - \gamma^{-1} \langle b_k | a_k \rangle \quad (4.5)$$

(the second term in the right-hand side of this formula stems from the fact that in the second sums in (4.2), (4.3) the term corresponding to  $j = k$  is present, as opposed to (2.2), (2.3)). The choice  $\mu_k = 1$  corresponds, therefore,

to the flow of the rational spin RS model with  $\lambda_k = -\gamma^{-1}\langle b_k|a_k\rangle$ . In order to get an approximation for the flow with  $\lambda_k = 0$  one can take, for example,  $\mu_k = 1 + h\gamma^{-1}\langle \tilde{b}_k|a_k\rangle$ .

The hyperbolic spin RS map is defined by:

$$e^{2(\tilde{x}_k - x_k)} - 1 = 2h\mu_k^{-1}\langle \tilde{b}_k|a_k\rangle, \quad (4.6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_k|\tilde{a}_k\rangle - |a_k\rangle &= -h\left[\sum_{j \neq k} |\tilde{a}_j\rangle\langle \tilde{b}_j|a_k\rangle\left(\coth(\tilde{x}_j - x_k) - 1\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^N |a_j\rangle\langle b_j|a_k\rangle\left(\coth(x_j - x_k + \gamma) - 1\right)\right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{b}_k| - \mu_k\langle b_k| &= h\left[\sum_{j \neq k} \langle \tilde{b}_k|a_j\rangle\langle b_j|\left(\coth(\tilde{x}_k - x_j) - 1\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^N \langle \tilde{b}_k|\tilde{a}_j\rangle\langle \tilde{b}_j|\left(\coth(\tilde{x}_k - \tilde{x}_j + \gamma) - 1\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Under the same assumption (4.4) as before, this system defines a map  $(x, a, b) \mapsto (\tilde{x}, \tilde{a}, \tilde{b})$  approximating the time  $h$  shift along the trajectories of the hyperbolic system (2.1)–(2.3) with

$$\lambda_k(x, a, b) = \mu_k^{(0)}(x, x, a, a, b, b) - (\coth(\gamma) - 1)\langle b_k|a_k\rangle. \quad (4.9)$$

The choice  $\mu_k = 1$  corresponds this time to the flow of the hyperbolic spin RS model with  $\lambda_k = -(\coth(\gamma) - 1)\langle b_k|a_k\rangle$ .

An outstanding property of the introduced discretizations for the spin RS models is their solvability. More precisely, they turn out to belong to the same hierarchies as their continuous time counterparts. That means that they admit discrete time Lax representations with the same Lax matrices as the continuous systems.

**Theorem 1.** *The maps (4.1)–(4.3) and (4.6)–(4.8) have the following discrete Lax representations:*

$$\tilde{L}\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}L \quad (4.10)$$

$$\tilde{A}\mathcal{M} = A(I + h\alpha L), \quad (I + h\alpha\tilde{L})\tilde{B} = \mathcal{M}B. \quad (4.11)$$

Here for the rational case  $\alpha = \gamma^{-1}$ ,  $L$  is as in (2.7), and

$$\mathcal{M}_{jk} = \frac{h\langle \tilde{b}_j|a_k\rangle}{\tilde{x}_j - x_k}; \quad (4.12)$$



for the hyperbolic case  $\alpha = \coth(\gamma) - 1$ ,  $L$  is as in (2.8), and

$$\mathcal{M}_{jk} = \frac{he^{x_k - \tilde{x}_j}}{\sinh(\tilde{x}_j - x_k)} \langle \tilde{b}_j | a_k \rangle; \quad (4.13)$$

in the both cases the condition

$$\mathcal{M}_{kk} = \mu_k \quad (4.14)$$

is imposed.

The **proof** of this Theorem follows by direct calculation. It should be remarked that the same phenomenon as in the continuous cases takes place, namely that the evolution equations (4.11) for  $A$ ,  $B$  are in a sense more fundamental than the Lax equation (4.10) for  $L$ : given the ansatz (2.7) or (2.8) for  $L$  and a corresponding ansatz (4.12) or (4.13) for  $\mathcal{M}$ , the Lax equation (4.10) is a consequence of (4.11).

From the Lax equation (4.10) follows that the equations (4.11) can be presented also as

$$\tilde{A} = A(I + h\alpha L)\mathcal{M}^{-1}, \quad \tilde{B} = \mathcal{M}(I + h\alpha L)^{-1}B. \quad (4.15)$$

As a consequence we get:  $\tilde{A}\tilde{B} = AB$ , or

$$\sum_{j=1}^N |\tilde{a}_j\rangle \langle \tilde{b}_j| = \sum_{j=1}^N |a_j\rangle \langle b_j|.$$

This allows to rewrite the hyperbolic map (4.6)–(4.8) in the following form:

$$\tanh(\tilde{x}_k - x_k) = h\nu_k^{-1} \langle \tilde{b}_k | a_k \rangle, \quad (4.16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_k |\tilde{a}_k\rangle - |a_k\rangle &= -h \left( \sum_{j \neq k} |\tilde{a}_j\rangle \langle \tilde{b}_j | a_k \rangle \coth(\tilde{x}_j - x_k) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^N |a_j\rangle \langle b_j | a_k \rangle \coth(x_j - x_k + \gamma) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{b}_k | - \nu_k \langle b_k | &= h \left( \sum_{j \neq k} \langle \tilde{b}_k | a_j \rangle \langle b_j | \coth(\tilde{x}_k - x_j) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^N \langle \tilde{b}_k | \tilde{a}_j \rangle \langle \tilde{b}_j | \coth(\tilde{x}_k - \tilde{x}_j + \gamma) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

(where  $\nu_k = \mu_k + h\langle \tilde{b}_k | a_k \rangle$ , so that, for example, the choice  $\nu_k = 1$  leads to a discretization of the hyperbolic spin RS model with  $\lambda_k = -\coth(\gamma)\langle b_k | a_k \rangle$ ).

It turns out to be possible to find continuous time flows from the spin RS hierarchies *interpolating* our maps (we say that a map is interpolated by a flow, if each orbit of the map is given by the values at  $t = nh$ ,  $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ , of a certain orbit of the flow). The following statement gives these interpolating flows. This, further, provides us with explicit solutions of the introduced discrete time dynamical systems.

**Theorem 2.** *The map (4.1)–(4.3) is interpolated by the flow of the rational spin RS hierarchy (3.1)–(3.3) with the function*

$$f(L) = L(I + h\gamma^{-1}L)^{-1}.$$

*Analogously, the map (4.6)–(4.8) is interpolated by the flow of the hyperbolic spin RS hierarchy (3.1)–(3.3) with the function*

$$f(L) = \frac{1}{2h} \log \left( \frac{I + h(\coth(\gamma) + 1)L}{I + h(\coth(\gamma) - 1)L} \right).$$

**Proof for the rational case.** Equations of motion (4.10), (4.15), where  $\alpha = \gamma^{-1}$ , have to be supplemented with an ansatz for  $\mathcal{M}$ , which may be also represented as an equation of motion for the auxiliary diagonal matrix  $X$  from (3.9):

$$\tilde{X}\mathcal{M} - \mathcal{M}X = h\tilde{B}A.$$

Introduce now the matrix

$$M = \mathcal{M}(I + h\gamma^{-1}L)^{-1}.$$

In terms of this matrix evolution equations may be presented as

$$\tilde{L} = MLM^{-1}, \tag{4.19}$$

$$\tilde{A} = AM^{-1}, \quad \tilde{B} = MB, \tag{4.20}$$

$$\tilde{X}M(I + h\gamma^{-1}L) - M(I + h\gamma^{-1}L)X = hMBA. \tag{4.21}$$

But the ansatz (2.7) for  $L$ , being equivalent to the commutation relation (3.11), implies:

$$(I + h\gamma^{-1}L)X = X(I + h\gamma^{-1}L) + hL - hBA.$$

This allows to rewrite (4.21) in the form

$$\widetilde{X}M - MX = hML(I + h\gamma^{-1}L)^{-1} = hMf(L). \quad (4.22)$$

Defining now  $V$  as the solution of the matrix difference equation

$$\widetilde{V}V^{-1} = M \quad (4.23)$$

with an initial condition  $V_0 = I$ , we see immediately that the solution of (4.19), (4.20), (4.22) is given by

$$L = VL_0V^{-1}, \quad A = A_0V^{-1}, \quad B = VB_0, \quad (4.24)$$

$$X = V(X_0 + nhf(L_0))V^{-1}, \quad (4.25)$$

which proves the Theorem in the rational case.

**Proof for the hyperbolic case.** The equations of motion (4.10), (4.15), where this time  $\alpha = e^{-\gamma}/\sinh(\gamma)$ , have to be supplemented with an ansatz for  $\mathcal{M}$ , which is this time equivalent to the following equation of motion for the auxiliary diagonal matrix  $X$  from (3.10):

$$\widetilde{X}\mathcal{M} - \mathcal{M}X = 2h\widetilde{B}AX.$$

In terms of the matrix

$$M = \mathcal{M}(I + h\alpha L)^{-1}$$

the evolution equations for  $L$ ,  $A$ ,  $B$  take the form (4.19), (4.20), and for  $X$  – the form

$$\widetilde{X}M(I + h\alpha L) - M(I + h\alpha L)X = 2hMBAX. \quad (4.26)$$

The ansatz (2.8) for  $L$  is equivalent to the commutation relation (3.12), which, in turn, implies:

$$(I + h\alpha L)X = X(I + h\alpha e^{2\gamma}L) - 2hBAX$$

(where we have taken into account that  $\alpha e^{\gamma}\sinh(\gamma) = 1$ ). This allows to rewrite (4.26) in the form

$$\widetilde{X}M = MX \frac{I + h\alpha e^{2\gamma}L}{I + h\alpha L} = MX e^{2hf(L)}. \quad (4.27)$$

Defining now  $V$  by (4.23), we see immediately that the solution of (4.19), (4.20), (4.27) is given by (4.24) and

$$X = VX_0 \left( \frac{I + h\alpha e^{2\gamma}L_0}{I + h\alpha L_0} \right)^n V^{-1} = VX_0 e^{2nhf(L_0)} V^{-1}, \quad (4.28)$$

which proves the Theorem in the hyperbolic case.

## 5 Connection with the usual RS model

In the case  $d = 1$ , i.e when  $|a_k\rangle, \langle b_k|$  become scalars, the spin RS models yield back the usual spinless ones [3], [4]. The usual RS hierarchy is now well studied. In particular, explicit solutions were found in [3], [4] for the rational and hyperbolic cases, and in [10] in the elliptic one; the Hamiltonian structure of the usual RS hierarchy is known and admits an  $r$ -matrix interpretation [21], [22], [23], [25].

To obtain the usual RS model from its spin counterpart in the case  $d = 1$ , one sets  $a_k b_k = c_k$  in (3.1)–(3.3), and it follows *irrespective* of the values of the parameters  $\lambda_k$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_k &= c_k, \\ \dot{c}_k &= c_k \sum_{j \neq k} c_j [V(x_k - x_j) - V(x_j - x_k)].\end{aligned}$$

These equations describe the usual RS model, the simplest flow of the usual RS hierarchy.

The same reduction is admissible for our discrete systems. Namely, *irrespective* of the values of parameters  $\mu_k$  the rational equations (4.1)–(4.3) imply:

$$h \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\tilde{c}_j}{\tilde{x}_j - x_k} - h \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{c_j}{x_j - x_k + \gamma} = 1, \quad (5.1)$$

$$-h \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\tilde{c}_j}{\tilde{x}_k - \tilde{x}_j + \gamma} + h \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{c_j}{\tilde{x}_k - x_j} = 1, \quad (5.2)$$

and the hyperbolic equations (4.16)–(4.18) imply:

$$h \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{c}_j \coth(\tilde{x}_j - x_k) - h \sum_{j=1}^N c_j \coth(x_j - x_k + \gamma) = 1, \quad (5.3)$$

$$-h \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{c}_j \coth(\tilde{x}_k - \tilde{x}_j + \gamma) + h \sum_{j=1}^N c_j \coth(\tilde{x}_k - x_j) = 1. \quad (5.4)$$

These equations are very similar to those found in [13], and can be analysed along the same lines. Namely, each pair of equations (5.1), (5.2) or (5.3), (5.4) may be considered as a linear system for  $2N$  variables  $c_k, \tilde{c}_k$  with a Cauchy matrix. This system may be explicitly solved, which allows then to write down "Newtonian" equations of motion in terms of  $x$  variables only.

To appreciate the difference between the equations found in [13] and here, it will be instructive to compare the Lax representations for them. Our results immediately imply the Lax representation of the form

$$\tilde{L}\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}L$$

where in the rational case

$$L = \sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{\gamma}{x_j - x_k + \gamma} c_k E_{jk}, \quad \mathcal{M} = \sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{h}{\tilde{x}_j - x_k} c_k E_{jk},$$

and in the hyperbolic case

$$L = \sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{\sinh(\gamma) e^{x_k - x_j}}{\sinh(x_j - x_k + \gamma)} c_k E_{jk}, \quad \mathcal{M} = \sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{h e^{x_k - \tilde{x}_j}}{\sinh(\tilde{x}_j - x_k)} c_k E_{jk}.$$

So, they belong to the same hierarchies as their continuous time counterparts; the interpolating flows are given by the same formulas as in Theorem 2.

The Lax representations for the systems found in [13] have the same (up to a simple gauge transformation) Lax matrices  $L$ , but different matrices  $\mathcal{M}$ , namely in the rational case

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{\gamma}{\tilde{x}_j - x_k + \gamma} c_k E_{jk},$$

and in the hyperbolic case

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{\sinh(\gamma) e^{x_k - \tilde{x}_j}}{\sinh(\tilde{x}_j - x_k + \gamma)} c_k E_{jk}.$$

Hence, they also belong to the same hierarchies as their continuous time counterparts, but are interpolated by different flows. In fact, interpolating flows were found in [13] to correspond to

$$f(L) = -(L + h\gamma^{-1})^{-1}$$

in the rational case, and to

$$f(L) = \frac{1}{2h} \log \left( \frac{L + h(\coth(\gamma) - 1)I}{L + h(\coth(\gamma) + 1)I} \right)$$

in the hyperbolic case.

We see that the maps found in the present Letter serve as approximations to the flow of the RS hierarchy with  $f(L) = L$ , which corresponds to the Hamiltonian function  $\varphi(L) = \text{tr}(L)$ , while the maps found in [13] serve as approximations to another flow of the RS hierarchy, characterized by  $f(L) = -L^{-1}$ , which corresponds to the Hamiltonian function  $\varphi(L) = \text{tr}(L^{-1})$ .<sup>1</sup>

## 6 Conclusion

This paper contains the application of a general procedure of integrable discretizations to the rational and hyperbolic spin RS models. There arise several natural questions.

- *What about elliptic spin RS model?* We have not pursued this point, basically because of the lacking Hamiltonian structure of this model. Indeed, a natural extension of our results to the elliptic case leads to a discrete Lax equation with a spectral parameter  $\lambda$ :

$$\tilde{L}(\lambda)\mathcal{M}(\lambda) = \mathcal{M}(\lambda)L(\lambda)$$

with the same Lax matrix

$$L(\lambda) = \sum_{j,k=1}^N \Phi(x_j - x_k + \gamma, \lambda) \langle b_j | a_k \rangle E_{jk}$$

as for the continuous system, and

$$\mathcal{M}(\lambda) = \sum_{j,k=1}^N \Phi(\tilde{x}_j - x_k, \lambda) \langle \tilde{b}_j | a_k \rangle E_{jk}$$

(here  $\Phi(x, \lambda) = \sigma(x + \lambda)/\sigma(x)\sigma(\lambda)$ , and  $\sigma(x)$  is the Weierstrass sigma function). However, in absence of the underlying Hamiltonian structure we can not make any assertions about complete integrability of the resulting system. A surrogate for this – an explicit solution of arbitrary flow in a hierarchy – is also not available in the elliptic case. We intend to return to the elliptic case in the future.

---

<sup>1</sup>*Both* maps are derived in the recent preprint [26] along with their Lax representations (in the general elliptic case). However, Hamiltonian interpretation and relations to continuous time hierarchies are not discussed there.

- *What about spin CM models?* These models, at least their rational and hyperbolic versions, can be discretized along the same lines as the spin RS models. However, this (paradoxically) turns out to be a technically more difficult problem. A reference to the standard implicit function theorem when discussing the equations of the type (4.1)–(4.3) has to be replaced by less trivial algebraic considerations. This will be discussed elsewhere.

## 7 Acknowledgement

The research of Yu.Suris is financially supported by DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft). He also thanks the University of Rome for support of the visit to Rome, where this work was done.

## References

- [1] M.A.Olshanetski, A.M.Perelomov. Classical integrable finite - dimensional systems related to Lie algebras. – *Phys. Rep.*, 1981, v.71, p.313.
- [2] D.Kazhdan, B.Kostant, S.Sternberg. Hamiltonian group actions and dynamical systems of Calogero type. – *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 1978, v.31, p.491–508.
- [3] S.N.M.Ruijsenaars, H.Schneider. A new class of integrable systems and its relation to solitons. – *Ann. Phys.*, 1986, v.170, p.370–405.
- [4] S.N.M.Ruijsenaars. Action–angle maps and scattering theory for some finite–dimensional integrable systems. – *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 1988, v.115, p.127–165.
- [5] J.Gibbons, T.Hermesen. A generalization of the Calogero–Moser system. – *Physica D*, 1984, v.11, p.337–348.
- [6] S.Wojciechowski. An integrable marriage of the Euler equations with the Calogero–Moser system. – *Phys.Lett.A*, 1985, v.111, p.101–103.
- [7] E.Billey, J.Avan, O.Babelon. The  $r$ -matrix structure of the Euler–Calogero–Moser model. – *Phys. Lett. A*, 1994, v.186, p.114;

- Exact Yangian symmetry in the classical Euler–Calogero–Moser model.  
– *Phys. Lett. A*, 1994, v.188, p.263.
- [8] J.Avan, O.Babelon, E.Billey. The Gervais–Neveu–Felder equation and the quantum Calogero–Moser systems. – hep-th/9505091.
  - [9] I.Krichever, O.Babelon, E.Billey, M.Talon. Spin generalizations of the Calogero–Moser system and the matrix KP equation. – hep-th/9411160.
  - [10] I.Krichever, A.Zabrodin. Spin generalization of the Ruijsenaars - Schneider model, non-abelian 2D Toda chain and representations of Sklyanin algebra. - hep-th/9505039.
  - [11] H.W.Braden, A.Hone. Affine Toda solitons and systems of Calogero–Moser type. – hep-th/9603178.
  - [12] F.Nijhoff, G.-D.Pang. A time discretized version of the Calogero–Moser model. – *Physics Lett. A*, 1994, v.191, p.101–107;  
Discrete-time Calogero–Moser model and lattice KP equation. – *In: Proc. Int. Workshop Symmetries and Integrability of difference eqs*, Eds. D.Levi, L.Vinet, P.Winternitz (to appear).
  - [13] F.Nijhoff, O.Ragnisco, V.Kuznetsov. Integrable time-discretization of the Ruijsenaars–Schneider model. – *Commun. Math. Phys*, 1996, v.176, p.681–700.
  - [14] S.Wojciechowski. The analogue of the Bäcklund transformation for integrable many-body systems. – *J.Phys.A*, 1982, v.15, p.L653–L657;  
On the integrability of the Calogero–Moser system in an external quartic potential and other many-body systems. – *Phys. Lett. A*, 1984, v.102, p.85–88.
  - [15] Yu.B.Suris. Bi-Hamiltonian structure of the *qd* algorithm and new discretizations of the Toda lattice. – *Physics Letters A*, 1995, v.206, p.153–161.
  - [16] Yu.B.Suris. A discrete-time relativistic Toda lattice. – *J.Physics A: Math. & Gen.*, 1996, v.29, p.451–465.



- [17] O.Ragnisco, M.Bruschi. Peakons,  $R$ -matrix and Toda lattice. – *Preprint*, 1995, solv-int 9509012.
- [18] Yu.B.Suris. A discrete time peakons lattice. – solv-int/9512001.
- [19] Yu.B.Suris. Discrete time Bogoyavlensky lattices. – solv-int/9512007.
- [20] O.Babelon, D.Bernard. The sine–Gordon solitons as an  $N$ -body problem. – *Phys. Lett. B*, 1993, v.317, p.363–368.
- [21] J.Avan, G.Rollet. The classical  $r$ -matrix for the relativistic Ruijsenaars–Schneider system. – *Phys. Lett. A*, 1996, v.212, p.50–54.
- [22] Yu.B.Suris. Why are the Ruijsenaars–Schneider and the Calogero–Moser hierarchies governed by the same  $r$ -matrix? – hep-th/9602160.
- [23] F.W.Nijhoff, V.B.Kuznetsov, E.K.Sklyanin, O.Ragnisco. Dynamical  $r$ -matrix for the elliptic Ruijsenaars–Schneider system. – solv-int/9603006.
- [25] Yu.B.Suris. Elliptic Ruijsenaars–Schneider and Calogero–Moser hierarchies are governed by the same  $r$ -matrix. – solv-int/9603011.
- [26] I.Krichever, O.Lipan, P.Wiegmann, A.Zabrodin. Quantum integrable systems and elliptic solutions of classical discrete nonlinear equations. – hep-th/9604080.